

VU Research Portal

The division of labor among egalitarian and traditional women: Differences in discontent, social comparison, and false consensus.

Buunk, B.P.; Kluwer, E.S.; Schuurman, M.; Siero, F.W.

published in

Journal of Applied Social Psychology
2000

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02822.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02822.x)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Buunk, B. P., Kluwer, E. S., Schuurman, M., & Siero, F. W. (2000). The division of labor among egalitarian and traditional women: Differences in discontent, social comparison, and false consensus. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 759-779. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02822.x>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

The Division of Labor Among Egalitarian and Traditional Women: Differences in Discontent, Social Comparison, and False Consensus

BRAM P. BUUNK,¹ ESTHER S. KLUWER, MIEKE K. SCHUURMAN,
AND FRANS W. SIERO
*University of Groningen
Groningen, the Netherlands*

We compared 118 egalitarian women (subscribers to the Dutch feminist magazine *Opzij*) with 118 traditional women (subscribers to the widely read Dutch women's magazine *Margriet*). On average, egalitarian women had a more equal division of household labor at home than did traditional women but experienced more discontent about the division of labor in their relationship. Egalitarian women with an unequal division of labor experienced more discontent than did traditional women with an unequal division of labor. Relative to traditional women, egalitarian women more often compared their own contribution to housework with their partner's contribution (relational comparison) and with other women's division of labor (referential comparison). Compared to traditional women, egalitarian women gave higher prevalence estimates of both the percentage of Dutch women doing virtually all housework and the percentage of women unhappy with the division of labor.

Over the past decades, the number of working women has steadily increased. In all Western Europe, the United States, and other developed countries, women's share in the labor force has increased from 33% in 1970 to 42% in 1990 (United Nations, 1995). In The Netherlands, women's participation in the labor force has increased from 30% in 1971 to 56% in 1991 (Hooghiemstra & Niphuis-Nell, 1993). It is no longer taken for granted that the wife is the full-time homemaker and the husband the single provider, and the number of couples aiming at an egalitarian division of labor at home seems to have grown (cf. Brehm, 1992; Rachlin, 1987; Sekaran, 1986). Nevertheless, the increase over the past decades in the percentage of adults favoring an equal division at home is still rather modest (Crosby, Farrell, & Cameron, 1994). Moreover, women still do a much larger share of the family work than do men, regardless of their own or their husbands' employment status. This is true for Western Europe (Kalleberg & Rosenfeld, 1990) and the United States (see Menaghan & Parcel, 1990; Thompson &

¹Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bram P. Buunk, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands. e-mail: a.p.buunk@ppsw.rug.nl.

Walker, 1989, for reviews). In developed countries, women perform two thirds to three quarters of the family work (United Nations, 1995). Dutch women in the 1990s still perform approximately 75% of the family work. Even in dual-earner marriages, few husbands equally share the work at home (e.g., Ferree, 1991; Major, 1993; Mederer, 1993; Mikula, Freudenthaler, Brennacher-Kröll, & Brunschko, 1997; Steil, 1994).

Not surprisingly, the factors related to the division of labor have been the subject of a substantial number of studies (e.g., Barnett & Baruch, 1983; Blair, 1993; Deutsch, Lussier, & Servis, 1993; Kluwer, Heesink, & Van de Vliert, 1996; for reviews, see Ferree, 1991; Thompson & Walker, 1989). A number of studies have examined whether individuals with egalitarian gender-role attitudes have a relatively more equal division of labor than do individuals with traditional gender-role attitudes (e.g., Barnett & Baruch, 1983; Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1984; Deutsch et al., 1993; Perry-Jenkins & Crouter, 1990). However, few studies have examined to what extent self-defined egalitarian women, who are explicit proponents of an equal division of labor and who are in favor of changing society in a more egalitarian direction, in fact have a more equal division of labor at home than do traditional women. Moreover, there is little research assessing whether egalitarian women are more satisfied or dissatisfied with the division of labor than are traditional women. Also, an interesting question is to what extent egalitarian and traditional women differ in social-comparison processes regarding the division of labor. The present research was carried out to examine differences between egalitarian and traditional women in the division of household labor at home, and perceptions and experiences related to this division.

A number of studies have suggested that women with egalitarian gender-role attitudes indeed have a more egalitarian division of labor at home, but are not necessarily happier in their marriages (e.g., VanYperen & Buunk, 1991). Their lower happiness may be a result of the role conflicts and the concomitant strains that egalitarian women experience and the fact that, despite a higher degree of equality, the task division often still falls short (cf. Yogeve, 1986). Such a lack of equality may particularly upset women with egalitarian gender-role attitudes (cf. Pina & Bengtson, 1993). Indeed, an unequal division of labor does not predict dissatisfaction unless personal attitudes are taken into account (Kluwer et al., 1996; cf. Major, 1993; Yogeve, 1981). Also, research has revealed that spouses with egalitarian gender-role attitudes experience more uncertainty and conflict about gender roles within the relationship because these roles are subject to change (Fitzpatrick, 1988; Kluwer, Heesink, & Van de Vliert, 1997; Scanzoni & Fox, 1980; Sillars & Kalbflesch, 1989; VanYperen & Buunk, 1991). Based on these findings, we assume that egalitarian women have accomplished a more equal division of household labor than have traditional women (Hypothesis 1), but nevertheless experience higher levels of discontent, as expressed in dissatisfaction and marital conflict about the division of household labor (Hypothesis 2).

Moreover, because egalitarian women value an equal division of household labor to a greater extent than do traditional women, an unequal division of labor to the woman's disadvantage will be associated with higher levels of discontent about the division of household labor among egalitarian women than among traditional women (Hypothesis 3).

Social Comparison

Beginning with Festinger's (1954) seminal social comparison theory, it has been assumed that an important mechanism for dealing with change and uncertainty is comparing one's experiences with those of others (e.g., Gerard & Rabbie, 1961; Mills & Mintz, 1972). A number of recent survey studies have indeed shown that, when faced with distress and uncertainty, individuals are relatively more inclined to seek out social-comparison information (Buunk, 1995; Buunk, Schaufeli, & Ybema, 1994), and this also applies to uncertainty and distress in marriage (Buunk, VanYperen, Taylor, & Collins, 1991). This notion is directly relevant for women aiming at an egalitarian division of labor. According to VanYperen and Buunk (1991), such women often lack adequate role models and may face several problems—including role overload, a confusion between acculturated roles and acquired roles, and sanctions from the environment (cf. Scanzoni & Fox, 1980; Sillars & Kalbflesch, 1989).

Because women trying to establish and maintain an egalitarian relationship may experience uncertainty about what is right and appropriate in this regard, they will compare themselves more with same-gender others than with traditional women (*referential comparison*). Traditional women experience a lower level of uncertainty because well-developed role models are available to them. In addition, egalitarian women may differ from traditional women, particularly in the frequency of comparisons with one's spouse (*relational comparison*). Egalitarians emphasize the similarity between men and women, and social comparison occurs especially with similars (cf. Major, 1993; VanYperen & Buunk, 1991). VanYperen and Buunk found, indeed, that relational comparisons were related more strongly to relationship satisfaction among egalitarian than among traditional women, although the difference was only marginally significant, and both types of comparison were related more to satisfaction among egalitarian women than among traditional women. It can thus be predicted that both referential comparisons and relational comparisons occur more frequently among egalitarian women than among traditional women (Hypothesis 4). Moreover, because distress is generally associated with an inclination to seek out social-comparison information (Buunk, 1994), we hypothesize that both types of social comparison will occur more frequently among those with a high degree of discontent over the division of labor than among those with a low degree of discontent (Hypothesis 5). Although we assume that egalitarian women experience more discontent than

do traditional women, we predict egalitarianism and discontent to be independently related to a higher frequency of social comparison.

It must be noted that most studies in this area, including the VanYperen and Buunk (1991) study, have focused on the perceived *outcomes* of comparison (e.g., "Do you think your marriage is better than that of most others?"). Such perceived outcomes, labeled *comparative ratings* by Wood (1989), may not necessarily reflect a social-comparison process (Diener & Fujita, 1997; Wood, 1989). As noted by Buunk (1994), in survey studies, a measure such as the one employed in the present study (i.e., the self-reported *frequency* of comparison) may be a better indicator of the extent to which individuals engage in social comparison.

Prevalence Estimates

While social comparisons often take the form of assessing one's current situation by relating it directly to the situation of comparable others, a particular type of social comparison consists of making assumptions about the prevalence of one's own characteristics in the population. Research on the false-consensus phenomenon has shown that individuals tend to assume that others are like themselves. *False consensus* occurs when individuals with a particular attribute tend to estimate the percentage of individuals in the population with the same characteristic as higher than individuals without that characteristic tend to do (Marks & Miller, 1987). For example, smokers estimate the percentage of smokers as higher than do nonsmokers (Sherman, Presson, Chassin, Corty, & Olshavsky, 1983), individuals who watch Wimbledon on television assume that more individuals do so than individuals who do not watch Wimbledon (Spears & Manstead, 1990), and those with a positive attitude toward casual sex estimate the percentage of others with a positive attitude as higher than do those with a negative attitude (Goethals, 1986). In line with the literature on false consensus, we predict that women with an unequal division of household labor estimate the prevalence of women with an unequal division of labor to be higher than the woman's disadvantage as higher than do women with an equal division of labor (Hypothesis 6).

Prevalence estimates may not only be based on a projection and justification of one's own characteristics. An egalitarian attitude may, in part, be supported by the perception that many women have an unequal division of household labor. This perception may be a result of a greater awareness of inequality (cf. Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995) or the selective memory of negative information about other relationships (cf. Fiske, 1980; Kanouse & Hanson, 1972; Peeters & Czapinski, 1990; Skowronski & Carlston, 1989; Taylor, 1991). In other words, egalitarian women are more aware of inequality than are traditional women, and egalitarian women may have a better memory for information about inequality in other women's relationships than they do for information about equality. Thus, we

expect egalitarian women to estimate the percentage of women with an unequal (i.e., traditional) division of housework as higher than do traditional women do (Hypothesis 7).

Although Hypotheses 6 and 7 may seem contradictory—egalitarian women are assumed to have a more equal division of labor (cf. Hypothesis 1)—they are not necessarily incompatible. For example, McFarland and Miller (1990) suggest that individuals may overestimate the number of others who share some characteristic, and at the same time believe that they possess a greater degree of this characteristic than do these other individuals (cf. Buunk & Van der Eijnden, 1997). Thus, we predict an egalitarian attitude and an unequal division of tasks at home to be independent predictors of the estimated prevalence of women with an unequal division of labor.

Because the literature on false consensus suggests that individuals will give relatively high estimates of the occurrence of their own attributes in the population (Marks & Miller, 1987), we predict that women with a high degree of discontent about the division of household labor will give higher prevalence estimates of the percentage of women who are dissatisfied with the division of labor than will women with a low degree of discontent (Hypothesis 8). The awareness of inequality will not only foster the perception that many women have an unequal division of household labor, but also that many women are unhappy with this task division. Therefore, we predict that egalitarian women will estimate the percentage of women dissatisfied with their division of household labor as higher than will traditional women (Hypothesis 9). We assume that an egalitarian attitude and discontent with the division of household labor are both related to estimates of the percentage of women dissatisfied with this division. It must be noted that the Hypotheses 6 through 9 have, as far as we know, not been examined in previous studies.

The present study was conducted in The Netherlands. To obtain a sample with sufficient variance in gender-role attitudes, we used subscription to a magazine that was explicitly defined as feminist (*Opzij*), versus subscription to a conventional women's magazine (*Margriet*), as a criterion to distinguish between egalitarian and traditional women. There were two reasons to do so. First, subscribing to a feminist magazine is a behavioral indicator of having an egalitarian attitude toward gender roles. Compared to acquiring two samples through, for example, a median split of gender-role attitudes from one sample of women, we expected our procedure to produce more homogeneous samples of egalitarian and traditional women. Second, subscribership to a feminist magazine probably represents more than just having egalitarian attitudes. Such a subscription implies taking an active stand on the issue of gender-role equality, and indicates a higher involvement with the issue than merely agreeing with egalitarian attitudes. In addition, subscribing to a feminist magazine may stem, in part, from a desire for social comparison because such a magazine offers a considerable amount of

social comparison about what other women think and feel about gender-related issues. Thus, it was examined whether there were effects of subscribership that were more than mainly effects of gender-role attitudes. Moreover, we examined whether egalitarian women differed from traditional women in demographic variables and whether such differences accounted for the observed differences.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Respondents were obtained through the cooperation of two major Dutch magazines, which gracefully allowed the use of their mailing list. The first magazine was *Opzij*, the foremost, and in fact only, monthly feminist magazine in the Netherlands, with 72,660 subscribers. The second magazine was a large Dutch women's magazine in the Netherlands, *Margriet*, with 305,262 subscribers. A random sample of 500 subscribers of each magazine was sent a mail questionnaire. From those who responded, only those who had a steady heterosexual relationship were included for the present study. Because more subscribers to *Opzij* ($n = 316$) responded than did subscribers to *Margriet* ($n = 118$), a random sample was taken from the *Opzij* subscribers of the same size as the final sample of *Margriet* subscribers ($n = 118$). This led to a total sample of 236 respondents.

The subscribers of the two magazines differed in a number of ways: *Margriet* subscribers were slightly older and more homogeneous in terms of age than were *Opzij* subscribers ($M = 43.67$, $SD = 9.57$, and $M = 39.91$, $SD = 14.04$, respectively), $F(1, 234) = 5.78$, $p < .05$, and had been involved in their current relationship longer ($M = 20.17$, $SD = 13.33$, and $M = 15.53$, $SD = 9.81$, respectively), $F(1, 234) = 5.78$, $p < .05$. *Opzij* subscribers were significantly more educated, $\chi^2(7, N = 236) = 124.60$, $p < .001$. Of the *Opzij* subscribers, no less than 81.4% had at least 4 years of college education, as compared to only 13.6% of the *Margriet* subscribers. Over half of the *Opzij* subscribers lived in urban environments (58.5%), whereas a large majority of *Margriet* subscribers lived in small towns and rural environments (92.4%), $\chi^2(3, N = 236) = 70.91$, $p < .001$. *Margriet* subscribers more often adhered to religion than did *Opzij* subscribers (74.8% vs. 38.3%), $\chi^2(5, N = 236) = 60.28$, $p < .001$. *Opzij* subscribers were somewhat more often employed (84.7% vs. 60.3%), $\chi^2(6, N = 236) = 30.89$, $p < .001$, and worked more hours per week (25.46 vs. 14.55 hr on average), $F(1, 232) = 31.00$, $p < .001$. *Margriet* and *Opzij* subscribers differed in terms of relationship status, $\chi^2(2, N = 236) = 18.57$, $p < .001$. More *Margriet* than *Opzij* subscribers were married (84.7% vs. 64.4%), whereas *Opzij* subscribers more often lived together (33.1% vs. 10.2%), and some respondents in both groups had steady partners (*Opzij* = 2.5%, *Margriet* = 5.1%). *Opzij* and *Margriet* subscribers did not differ in number of children in their homes.

Questionnaire

Division of labor. For eight areas (doing the dishes, grocery shopping, cooking, cleaning bathrooms, doing laundry, minor repairs, vacuum cleaning, and keeping up the yard), the respondent was asked whether she herself did most of this work (scored as 1), whether both partners did about the same (scored as 2), or whether her partner did most of this work (scored as 3). Because preliminary analyses showed that in virtually all cases respondents did more than their partners and that there were linear relationships with all other variables, an index was created by summing these items and dividing them by the number of items. Thus, a lower score indicates that the division of labor within the relationship is more unequal, to the woman's disadvantage, and a score of 2 indicates an equal division.

Discontent. This variable was measured with an ad hoc scale of six items. Two items referred to satisfaction with the division of household labor: "I think my partner does . . . tasks at home" (1 = *much too little* to 5 = *much too much*), and "How happy are you with the division of household tasks between you and your partner?" (1 = *very unhappy* to 5 = *very happy*). The items were reverse-scored. Four items referred to marital conflict about the division of household labor ("Do you ever fight with your partner because you feel he does too little at home?," "How often do you try to induce your partner to do housework?," "How often do you point out to your partner that he accomplishes too few tasks at home?," and "How often do you talk with your partner about your discontent with his share in household tasks?"). These items were answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*often*). All items were summed. The lowest and highest possible scores were thus 6 and 30, respectively, with a higher score indicating a higher level of discontent. The coefficient alpha was .91.

Perceived prevalence. In line with the usual procedure in false-consensus research (e.g., Spears & Manstead, 1990), respondents were asked, "According to you, what percentage of Dutch women is unhappy with the division of household tasks between herself and her partner?" and "According to you, what percentage of Dutch women does virtually all household tasks?" Respondents filled in a percentage.

Social comparison. To assess the frequency of relational comparison, respondents were asked, "How often do you compare the amount of housework you do with the amount of housework your partner does?" The question to assess frequency of referential comparison read, "Do you ever compare the division of household labor in your relationship with that of other women?" Both questions were answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*often*). Similar questions have been asked in other studies on social comparison (e.g., Buunk & Ybema, 1995; Van der Zee, Buunk, & Sanderman, 1996).

Gender-role attitudes. This scale contained 20 items and was based, in part, on the gender-role attitudes scale developed by VanYperen and Buunk (1991).

Care was taken to include items that spanned the spectrum from moderate to radical attitudes. Moderate items included the following: "A woman could have a part-time job, even when she has small children," "It is a good thing that the husband performs household tasks on a regular basis so that the wife has more time to herself," and "The best marriage is a marriage in which the wife also has her activities outside the home." Examples of radical items are: "It is about time that men take primary responsibility for the household," "From the beginning of a relationship, a woman has to be careful that she is not pushed into the traditional female role," and "It should be forbidden to hire men for jobs in which the majority of employees is male." All items were rated on 6-point scales ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 6 (*completely agree*). The lowest and highest possible scores were thus 20 and 120, respectively. The alpha reliability was .87.

Preliminary Analyses

As would be expected, gender-role attitudes were much more egalitarian among *Opzij* ($M = 93.86$, $SD = 11.69$) than among *Margriet* ($M = 75.32$, $SD = 11.69$) respondents, $F(1, 234) = 106.77$, $p < .001$. Given the substantial demographic differences between both subsamples, a series of ANCOVAs was conducted to examine the extent to which the difference in gender-role attitudes remained when controlling for each of the demographic variables. In all analyses, the difference in gender-role attitudes remained significant, indicating that the difference in gender-role attitudes between the subscribers of the two magazines was a robust one. In addition, it was primarily egalitarian women, and not higher educated, younger, nonreligious, gainfully employed women per se who subscribed to *Opzij*; and more traditional women, and not lower educated, older, religious, housewives per se who subscribed to *Margriet*. Given the fact that subscribership is directly and independently related to gender-role attitudes, it is justified to view subscribership as an index of such attitudes. Nevertheless, we not only examined the effects of subscribership on the dependent variables, but also the associations between gender-role attitudes and these variables. In this way, the robustness of the findings can be assessed, and it can be examined if subscribership represents anything above and beyond gender-role attitudes.

Results

Division of Labor and Discontent

It was predicted that egalitarian women would have a more equal division of household labor than would traditional women (Hypothesis 1). An ANOVA, with subscribership as the independent variable and division of labor as the dependent variable, showed that this was indeed the case, $F(1, 226) = 8.08$, $p < .01$. As

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Margriet and Opzij Subscribers and Correlations With Gender-Role Attitudes

	Subscribership				Gender- role attitudes <i>r</i>
	<i>Margriet</i>		<i>Opzij</i>		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Division of labor	1.70	0.29	1.82	0.31	.18*
Discontent	13.39	3.85	15.97	4.95	.38**
Social comparison					
Relational	2.33	0.98	3.45	1.02	.53**
Referential	2.50	1.02	3.39	1.07	.43**
Prevalence estimates					
Women doing virtually all household tasks	52.12	17.70	58.09	19.27	.32**
Women unhappy with division of household tasks	66.30	17.77	69.83	16.21	.17*

* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 1 shows, egalitarian women (*Opzij* subscribers) had a mean closer to 2 than did traditional women (*Margriet* subscribers), indicating that, in this sample, the division of labor at home approached equality to a greater extent among egalitarian women than among traditional women. Moreover, there was a small correlation between gender-role attitudes and the degree in which the task division at home was more to the advantage of women (Table 1). As predicted in Hypothesis 2, an ANOVA with subscribership as independent variable and discontent as dependent variable showed a significant effect of subscribership, $F(1, 227) = 19.31, p < .001$ (Table 1). Egalitarian women experienced a higher degree of discontent about the division of labor than did traditional women. In addition, gender-role attitudes were positively correlated with discontent.

It was further predicted that an unequal division of labor would be associated with discontent more strongly among egalitarian women than among traditional women (Hypothesis 3). A hierarchical ANOVA with subscribership as a regular factor, the division of labor as a continuous factor, and discontent as the dependent variable produced a significant effect of subscribership, $F(1, 217) = 9.70, p < .01$, and a significant effect of task division, $F(1, 217) = 30.12, p < .001$. A

Table 2

Regression of Dependent Variables on Gender-Role Attitudes and Division of Labor

Dependent variable	Predictors	β	R^2
Discontent	Gender-role attitudes	0.45**	.27
	Division of labor	-0.36**	
Relational comparisons	Gender-role attitudes	0.31**	.56
	Discontent	0.57**	
Referential comparisons	Gender-role attitudes	0.30**	.25
	Discontent	0.31**	
Prevalence estimate: Women doing virtually all household tasks	Gender-role attitudes	0.22*	.31
	Division of labor	-0.26**	
Prevalence estimate: Women unhappy with division of household tasks	Gender-role attitudes	0.35**	.11
	Division of labor	-0.08	

* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

less equal division of labor was accompanied by more discontent. As predicted, these main effects were qualified by a significant interaction between subscribership and task division, $F(1, 217) = 4.81, p < .05$. Among egalitarian women, an equal division of labor correlated more negatively with discontent ($r = -.44$) than among traditional women ($r = -.24$). Thus, in line with the prediction, an unequal division of household labor appeared to generate more discontent among egalitarian women than among traditional women. An analysis with gender-role attitudes instead of subscribership as predictor revealed similar results, but no significant interaction (Table 2).

Social Comparison

It was predicted that both relational and referential comparisons would occur more frequently among egalitarian women than among traditional women (Hypothesis 4), and would occur more frequently among those with a high degree

of discontent about the division of labor (Hypothesis 5). To test the hypotheses for relational comparison, an ANOVA was conducted with subscribership as a regular factor, discontent as a continuous factor, and relational comparison frequency as the dependent variable. This analysis produced a significant effect of subscribership, $F(1, 209) = 42.51, p < .001$, as well as a strong, highly significant effect of discontent, $F(1, 209) = 161.22, p < .001$. In line with Hypothesis 4, egalitarian women more often compared their own contribution to the division of household labor with their partner's contribution than did traditional women (Table 1). Moreover, supporting Hypothesis 5, the frequency of relational comparison was higher among women feeling discontent about the division of household labor, as became apparent from the high correlation between both variables ($r = .69, p < .001, \beta = 0.66, p < .001$). A regression analysis with gender-role attitudes instead of subscribership as the predictor confirmed that both an egalitarian attitude and discontent over the division of labor explained unique variance in more frequent comparisons with the partner (Table 2).

The same predictions were tested with regard to referential comparisons, employing an ANOVA with subscribership as a regular factor and discontent as a continuous factor, and referential comparison frequency as the dependent variable. Again, this provided a significant effect of subscribership, $F(1, 226) = 22.26, p < .001$. As predicted, referential comparisons occurred more frequently among egalitarian women than among traditional women (Table 1). Moreover, as expected, there was a strong effect of discontent with the division of household labor, $F(1, 226) = 31.33, p < .001$. Discontent was accompanied by a higher frequency of referential comparison ($r = .43, p < .001, \beta = 0.35, p < .001$). A regression analysis with gender-role attitudes instead of subscribership as the predictor confirmed that both an egalitarian attitude and discontent over the division of labor were independently related to frequent comparisons with same-gender others (Table 2).²

Prevalence Estimates

In line with the false-consensus effect, it was predicted that those with an unequal division of labor would make higher estimates of women doing virtually all household labor than those with an equal division of labor (Hypothesis 6).

²An ANOVA with subscribership as a regular factor, division of labor as a covariate, and comparison frequency as the dependent variable produced a significant effect of subscribership, $F(1, 203) = 9.77, p < .01$, and no significant effect of division of labor, $F < 1$. There was, however, a marginally significant interaction between both variables, $F(1, 203) = 3.46, p = .06$, that was difficult to interpret.

It was further examined if the frequency of relational and referential comparison both were independently related to discontent. That proved not to be the case: In a regression with both types of comparisons as predictors and discontent as dependent variable, relational comparison frequency ($\beta = 0.66, p < .001$), but not referential comparison frequency ($\beta = 0.04, ns$), had an independent effect. There were no interactions with subscribership.

Moreover, it was predicted that egalitarian women would estimate the percentage of women with an unequal division of household labor as higher than would traditional women (Hypothesis 7). To examine both predictions simultaneously, a hierarchical ANOVA was conducted with subscribership as a regular factor and division of labor as a continuous factor. This analysis produced significant effects for both subscribership, $F(1, 221) = 5.57, p < .05$, and for task division, $F(1, 221) = 14.23, p < .001$. As predicted, egalitarian women estimated the percentage of relationships with an unequal division of labor as higher than did traditional women (Table 1), and more unequal task divisions were related to higher prevalence estimates of women with an unequal division of household labor in the population ($r = .22, p < .001, \beta = 0.25, p < .001$). A regression analysis with gender-role attitudes and division of labor as predictors and prevalence estimates of women doing virtually all household tasks as the dependent variable also showed independent effects of both predictors (Table 2).

In line with the false-consensus effect, it was predicted that those more discontent about the division of labor would make higher prevalence estimates of the percentage of women dissatisfied with the division of labor (Hypothesis 8), and that egalitarian women would make higher estimates of the percentage of women dissatisfied with the division of labor (Hypothesis 9). To test both hypotheses simultaneously, a hierarchical ANOVA was conducted with subscribership as a regular factor and discontent as a continuous factor. This analysis produced a significant effect of subscribership, $F(1, 223) = 4.79, p < .05$. Egalitarian women estimated the percentage of women unhappy with the division of labor as higher than did traditional women (Table 1). However, no significant effect of discontent was found, $F(1, 217) = 0.06, ns$. In a similar vein, a regression analysis with gender-role attitudes and the division of labor as predictors and estimates of the prevalence of women unhappy with the division of household tasks as the dependent variable showed an effect of gender-role attitudes only (Table 2). Thus, Hypothesis 9 was confirmed, but Hypothesis 8 was not.

Additional Analyses

Because subscribers to the feminist magazine *Opzij* differed in many demographic characteristics from subscribers to the more conventional *Margriet*, the question arises to what extent the effects of subscribership may be a result of these demographic differences. Therefore, it was examined whether the six dependent variables (task division, discontent, relational comparison, referential comparison, prevalence estimates for unequal division of labor, and prevalence estimates for discontent) were related to age, educational level, number of hours employed, relationship status, and religiosity. When a significant relationship was found, it was examined whether the difference between both groups remained intact when controlling for the demographic variable.

These analyses showed that, in general, the effects of subscribership on discontent and on social comparison still remained highly significant when controlling for the demographic variables. Thus, subscribership as such seemed to be associated with discontent over the division of household labor and with heightened social-comparison activity, independent of background characteristics. However, the effects on task division and prevalence estimates became weaker or even disappeared. It is, in particular, noteworthy that there was a high correlation between number of hours employed and an equal division of household labor (or unequal, to the woman's advantage) and that including the number of hours employed as a covariate made the effect of subscribership on task division disappear. This suggests that a less extensive involvement of traditional women in paid work may be responsible for the fact that they take on a larger share of household labor.³

Because the data showed that the effects of subscribership were similar to the effects of gender-role attitude, the question arises to what extent there is still an independent effect of subscribership as an expression of an egalitarian position. Therefore, it was examined whether the effects of subscribership on the dependent variables still existed when the effect of gender-role attitudes was controlled for. In all cases, the effect of subscribership became weaker or nonsignificant, except for the two social-comparison measures. Apparently, not only egalitarian gender-role attitudes as such, but also taking a stand as apparent from subscribing

³Discontent was correlated with age ($r = -.18, p < .01$), educational level ($r = .25, p < .001$), and religiosity ($r = -.33, p < .001$), but not with number of hours employed and relationship status. Nevertheless, when controlling for these variables, the effect of subscribership was, though somewhat weaker, still significant in all cases: for age, $F(1, 213) = 16.21, p < .001$; for educational level, $F(1, 226) = 5.18, p < .05$; and for religiosity, $F(1, 226) = 7.38, p < .001$.

Positive correlations were found between frequency of relational comparisons and most demographic variables, except for relationship status (age, $r = -.29$; educational level, $r = .48$; number of hours employed, $r = .32$; and for religiosity, $r = -.29$; all $ps < .001$). Controlling for these variables, the effect of subscribership remained highly significant in all cases (for all F s, $p < .001$). Also, positive correlations existed between frequency of referential comparisons and most demographic variables, except relationship status (age, $r = -.21$; educational level $r = .40$; number of hours employed, $r = .28$; and religiosity, $r = -.29$; all $ps < .001$). Nevertheless, when controlling for these variables, the effect of subscribership remained highly significant in all cases (for all F s, $p < .001$).

Educational level ($r = .22, p < .01$) and number of hours employed ($r = .41, p < .001$), but not age, relationship status, and religiosity correlated with a more equal division of labor. Controlling for educational level (as well as number of working hours), the effect of subscribership was no longer significant (F s < 1). Only religiosity ($r = .21, p < .001$) was correlated with the perceived prevalence of an unequal task division. Controlling for religiosity, the effect of subscribership was no longer significant ($F < 1$).

The perceived prevalence of women who were dissatisfied with the division of household labor correlated with educational level ($r = .17, p < .01$), relationship status ($r = .16, p < .01$), number of hours employed ($r = .17, p < .01$), and religiosity ($r = .19, p < .01$). Controlling for these variables, the effect of subscribership became weaker: for educational level and religiosity, F s < 1 ; for relationship status, $F(1, 229) = 4.25, p < .05$; and for hours employed, $F(1, 228) = 2.91, p < .10$.

to a feminist magazine are associated with heightened social-comparison activity with the partner, as well as with other women.⁴

Discussion

The present research compared subscribers to *Opzij*, a feminist magazine, with subscribers to *Margriet*, a conventional women's magazine, to examine the impact of egalitarianism on the division of household labor, discontent about the division of labor, perceived prevalence in the population of an unequal division of labor and discontent with this labor division, as well as on the frequency of social comparisons. As outlined by many authors, egalitarian women aim primarily at equality, rather than at equity in the division of labor (e.g., Steil, 1994). The results of this study suggest that egalitarian women have indeed succeeded in this goal, to some degree. Egalitarian women not only had a more equal division of labor than did traditional women, but also had a division of labor that approached equality. This equality was primarily related to gender-role attitudes, and not to subscribing to *Opzij* as such.

It must be noted that differences in equality of the division of labor among egalitarian and traditional women disappeared when controlling for the number of hours of paid work. This suggests that a less equal division of household labor among traditional women is, in part, related to the fact that they spend less time on paid work and that the more equal division of labor reported by egalitarian women is, to a large extent, a consequence of their extensive involvement in paid work. Of course, it is also possible that traditional women work fewer hours outside the home than do egalitarian women because their household and child care require more time, with their husbands putting less effort in this realm.

In line with the predictions and with other research (e.g., Pina & Bengtson, 1993; VanYperen & Buunk, 1991), egalitarian women experienced more discontent, as expressed by dissatisfaction and conflict, about the division of labor than did traditional women. This discontent appeared to be related primarily to explicit egalitarian attitudes and not to subscribership per se, and could not be explained by such various demographic factors as educational level, age, and religiosity.

Why do egalitarian women experience more discontent? Our explanation is that attaining and maintaining a relatively equal division of household chores requires regular pressure on the partner to keep him committed to doing his share. Many researchers have suggested that men, in general, feel less responsibility, especially for household chores than do women (e.g., Scanlon & Fox,

⁴Controlling for gender-role attitudes, the effects of subscribership were as follows: on division of labor, $F(1, 221) = 2.76, p = .10$; on discontent, $F(1, 226) = 1.71, p = .20$; on both perceived prevalence measures, $F_s < 1$; on relational comparison, $F(1, 215) = 17.69, p = .000$; and on referential comparisons, $F(1, 233) = 10.24, p < .01$.

1980; Steil, 1994), and for egalitarian women this is particularly upsetting. Among egalitarian women, there was indeed a higher correlation between discontent and inequality of the division of labor than among traditional women. This was theoretically predicted and suggests rather strongly that inequality is more distressing for egalitarian women than for traditional women. The fact that *Opzij* subscribers were more discontented, despite a relatively more equal division, suggests that even the relatively small degree of inequality is still felt as unfair and falls short of one's aims.

In sum, egalitarian women have achieved a more equal division of labor, and yet reported more discontent than did traditional wives. These results are in line with recent findings that show that women with traditional gender-role attitudes are more likely to avoid marital conflict over the division of labor than are women with egalitarian gender-role attitudes (Kluwer et al., 1997). These findings challenge the notion that women lack feelings of discontent and perceive the division of labor as more fair than would be expected, given its inequality (Major, 1993; Thompson, 1991). Rather, this may be the case particularly among women with traditional attitudes toward gender roles. For example, recent findings suggest that wives' feelings of appreciation for their family labor were the most important predictor of their sense of fairness (Hawkins, Marshall, & Meiners, 1995). However, appreciation for family work may very well be more important for traditional women than for egalitarian women. The roles of housekeeper and mother often constitute the major life roles for traditional women, whereas the work role may be more important for egalitarian women than for traditional women. Indeed, the present study shows that egalitarian women spend more time doing paid work than do traditional women.

The findings with respect to the prevalence estimates were, in part, in line with the predictions. A false-consensus effect was found for task division: Those with an unequal division of labor estimated the percentage of women doing the major share of the household labor as higher than did women with a more equal division of labor. However, no false-consensus effect was found for discontent. Those who were unhappy with the division of household labor did not estimate the percentage of women who are discontented with the division of labor as higher than did those who were happy with the division of labor. Nevertheless, egalitarian women estimated the percentage of women who are discontented with the division of labor as higher than did traditional women. Because egalitarian women were more discontented with the task division, this effect may be interpreted as an indirect false-consensus effect. This effect appeared to exist mainly because of gender-role attitudes, and not because of subscribership per se, and was, to some extent, independent of demographic variables.

In contrast to the indirect false-consensus effect, discontented, egalitarian women (who had a more equal division of labor) estimated the percentage of women with an unequal division of labor as higher than did traditional women.

This type of perception may be a characteristic of groups concerned with societal change, simply because such estimates constitute a basic motivation for this type of group. Members of such groups would have the conviction that a great deal must be changed, otherwise they would not have joined the group. They also experience a greater awareness of the specific problem or the situation they are trying to change.

Moreover, an element of being a member of an activist group may be the perception of false uniqueness. Indeed, under certain conditions, individuals with a particular attribute tend to assume that there are fewer others with that same attribute than do individuals without that attribute. There is some evidence that false uniqueness occurs particularly for desirable attributes (e.g., Spears & Manstead, 1990; Suls, Wan, & Sanders, 1988). Therefore, it is not surprising that egalitarian women assume that they have a more equal division of labor—for them a highly desirable attribute—than do most other individuals.

We predicted that egalitarian attitudes as well as discontent about the division of labor would be associated with a higher frequency of social comparisons. Strong evidence was found for these predictions. There were highly significant effects of subscribership on the frequency of engaging in comparisons with the partner (relational comparisons), as well as on the frequency of engaging in comparisons with same-gender others (referential comparisons), and these effects remained significant when controlling for demographic variables. Moreover, discontent had significant effects on the two forms of social comparison, above and beyond the effects of subscribership. These findings can be interpreted as indicating that the stress induced by conflicts over the division of labor generates social-comparison activity, an interpretation that is in line with a number of recent studies in populations under stress (for a review, see Buunk, 1994).

As far as we know, although a number of studies in this area have focused on the perceived outcomes of comparison (comparative ratings; cf. Wood, 1989), the present study is the first to examine the self-reported frequency of comparison as related to gender-role attitudes and discontent about the division of household labor. As noted by Buunk (1994), this frequency may be a less equivocal indicator of the extent to which individuals engage in social comparisons than the perceived outcomes of comparison.

Although we assumed that the association between gender-role attitudes and social-comparison activity stems from the fact that egalitarian women face relatively more uncertainty because of a lack of role models, there are a number of alternative explanations for this finding. First, the high frequency of social comparison among women who favor egalitarian gender roles could stem from their concern about equality. One could argue that individuals only compare themselves with others when they want to assess if they are getting at least as good a deal as the others are getting. The fact that egalitarianism as such (as expressed in subscribership, as well as in gender-role attitudes), above and

beyond discontent, was related to social-comparison activity suggests that social comparisons are partially the direct result of an egalitarian attitude. A second explanation is that social comparisons cause egalitarian women to be relatively dissatisfied. It seems likely that this process plays at least a partial role. Comparing one's own outcomes with those of one's partner and with those of other women may imply focusing on the aspects in which one is worse off than others. There is some truth in the saying that "The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence."

A final explanation for the higher frequency of social comparison is that subscribing to *Opzij* stems in part from a need for social comparison, and that egalitarian women high in such a need are overrepresented in the subscribership. The finding that the effects of subscribership on social-comparison activity are indeed independent of the effect of gender-role attitudes as such strongly supports this interpretation. In general, joining a group of similars will stem in part from a desire for social comparison, and a magazine such as *Opzij* contains a considerable amount of information about the experiences and opinions of other feminist women.

The present findings suggest that egalitarian women these days face a double burden: Not only must they convince traditional women, who are not particularly dissatisfied, of the necessity of an egalitarian task division, but they are also relatively unhappy with the division of household labor and do have to fight with their partner to attain a more equal task division (cf. Kluwer et al., 1997). Of course, the reported findings could be typical for the present transitional time period (cf. VanYperen & Buunk, 1991). It is often suggested that the egalitarian lifestyle may represent the wave of the future (cf. Ladewig & White, 1984). If the number of egalitarian relationships will indeed increase, this development will influence the economic, governmental, educational, social, and cultural trends in society (Sekaran, 1986). More egalitarian and less traditional role models will become available. Consequently, changes in family values and norms will occur, and spouses will move away from traditional role patterns toward more equitable role sharing. Moreover, in the future, an increasing number of young adults will have grown up in nontraditional families and will have internalized the norms and values of equitable role sharing. All of this might result in a reduction of feelings of uncertainty about how things are going in the relationship among egalitarians. Hence, when a majority of the marital relationships can be characterized as egalitarian, it is conceivable that traditional women will be less satisfied and more uncertain about their relationships.

References

- Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K. (1983). Determinants of fathers' participation in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **49**, 29-40.

- Bird, G. W., Bird, G. A., & Scruggs, M. (1984). Determinants of family task sharing: A study of husbands and wives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **46**, 345-355.
- Blair, S. L. (1993). Employment, family, and perceptions of marital quality among husbands and wives. *Journal of Family Issues*, **14**, 189-212.
- Brehm, S. S. (1992). *Intimate relationships*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Buunk, B. P. (1994). Social comparison processes under stress: Towards an integration of classic and recent perspectives. In M. Hewstone & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 211-241). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Buunk, B. P. (1995). Comparison direction and comparison dimension among disabled individuals: Towards a refined conceptualization of social comparison under stress. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **21**, 316-330.
- Buunk, B. P., Schaufeli, W. B., & Ybema, J. F. (1994). Burnout, uncertainty, and the desire for social comparison among nurses. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **24**, 1701-1718.
- Buunk, B. P., & Van der Eijnden, R. J. J. M. (1997). Perceived prevalence, perceived superiority, and relationship satisfaction: Most relationships are good, but ours is the best. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **23**, 219-228.
- Buunk, B. P., VanYperen, N. W., Taylor, S. E., & Collins, R. L. (1991). Social comparison and the drive upward revisited: Affiliation as a response to marital stress. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **21**, 529-546.
- Buunk, B. P., & Ybema, J. F. (1995). Selective evaluation and coping with stress: Making one's situation cognitively more livable. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **25**, 1499-1517.
- Crosby, F., Farrell, R., & Cameron, A. E. (1994). Changing sex-role expectations and men's concerns with justice in the home. In M. J. Lerner & G. Mikula (Eds.), *Entitlement and the affectional bond. Justice in close relationships* (pp. 259-279). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Deutsch, F. M., Lussier, J. B., & Servis, L. J. (1993). Husbands at home: Predictors of paternal participation in child care and housework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **65**, 1154-1166.
- Diener, E., & Fujita, F. (1997). Social comparisons and subjective well-being. In B. P. Buunk & F. X. Gibbons (Eds.), *Health, coping and well-being. Perspectives from social comparison theory* (pp. 329-358). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferree, M. M. (1991). The gender division of labor in two-earner marriages. *Journal of Family Issues*, **12**, 158-180.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, **7**, 117-140.

- Fiske, S. T. (1980). Attention and weight in person perception: The impact of negative and extreme behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **38**, 889-906.
- Gerard, H. B., & Rabbie, J. M. (1961). Fear and social comparison. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, **62**, 586-592.
- Goethals, G. R. (1986). Social comparison theory: Psychology from the lost and found. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **12**, 261-277.
- Hawkins, A. J., Marshall, C. M., & Meiners, K. M. (1995). Exploring wives' sense of fairness about family work. *Journal of Family Issues*, **16**, 693-721.
- Hooghiemstra, B. T. J., & Niphuis-Nell, M. (1993). *Sociale atlas van de vrouw: Deel 2* [Women's social atlas]. Rijswijk, The Netherlands: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Kalleberg, A. L., & Rosenfeld, R. A. (1990). Work in the family and in the labor market: A cross-national, reciprocal analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **52**, 331-346.
- Kanouse, D. E., & Hanson, L. R. (1972). Negativity in evaluations. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes and consequences of behavior* (pp. 47-62). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Kelly, C., & Breinlinger, S. (1995). Identity and injustice: Exploring women's participation in collective action. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, **5**, 41-57.
- Kluwer, E. S., Heesink, J. A. M., & Van de Vliert, E. (1996). Marital conflict about the division of household and paid labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **58**, 958-969.
- Kluwer, E. S., Heesink, J. A. M., & Van de Vliert, E. (1997). The marital dynamics of conflict over the division labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **59**, 635-653.
- Ladewig, B. H., & White, P. N. (1984). Dual-earner marriages: The family social environment and dyadic adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues*, **5**, 343-362.
- Major, B. (1993). Gender, entitlement, and the distribution of family labor. *Journal of Social Issues*, **49**, 141-159.
- Marks, G., & Miller, N. (1987). Ten years of research on the false consensus effect: An empirical and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, **102**, 72-90.
- McFarland, C., & Miller, D. T. (1990). Judgment of self-other similarity: Just like other people, only more so. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **16**, 475-484.
- Mederer, H. J. (1993). Division of labor in two-earner homes: Task accomplishment versus household management as critical variables in perceptions about family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **55**, 133-145.
- Menaghan, E. G., & Parcel, T. L. (1990). Parental employment and family life: Research in the 1980s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **52**, 1079-1098.

- Mikula, G., Freudenthaler, H. H., Brennacher-Kröll, S., & Brunschko, B. (1997). Division of labor in student households: Gender inequality, perceived justice, and satisfaction. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, **19**, 275-289.
- Mills, J., & Mintz, P. M. (1972). Effect of unexplained arousal on affiliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **24**, 11-13.
- Peeters, G., & Czapinski, J. (1990). Positive-negative asymmetry in evaluations: The distinction between affective and informational negativity effects. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 33-60). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., & Crouter, A. C. (1990). Men's provider-role attitudes: Implications for household work and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues*, **11**, 136-156.
- Pina, D. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). The division of household labor and wives' happiness: Ideology, employment, and perceptions of support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **55**, 901-912.
- Rachlin, V. C. (1987). Fair versus equal role relations in dual-career and dual-earner families: Implications for family interventions. *Family Relations*, **36**, 187-192.
- Scanzoni, J., & Fox, G. L. (1980). Sex roles, family, and society: The seventies and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **42**, 743-755.
- Sekaran, U. (1986). *Dual-earner families: Contemporary organizational and counseling issues*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sherman, S. J., Presson, L., Chassin, C. C., Corts, E., & Olshavsky, R. (1983). The false consensus effect in estimates of smoking prevalence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **9**, 197-207.
- Sillars, A. L., & Kalbflesch, P. J. (1989). Implicit and explicit decision-making styles in couples. In D. Brinberg & J. Jaccard (Eds.), *Dyadic decision-making* (pp. 179-215). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Skowronski, J. J., & Carlston, D. E. (1989). Negativity and extremity biases in impression formation: A review of explanations. *Psychological Bulletin*, **105**, 131-142.
- Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1990). Consensus estimation in a social context. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 81-110). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Steil, J. M. (1994). Equality and entitlement in marriage: Benefits and barriers. In M. J. Lerner & G. Mikula (Eds.), *Entitlement and the affectional bond. Justice in close relationships* (pp. 229-258). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Suls, J., Wan, C. K., & Sanders, G. S. (1988). False consensus and false uniqueness in estimating the prevalence of health-protective behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **18**, 66-79.
- Taylor, S. E. (1991). Asymmetrical effects of positive and negative events: The mobilization-minimization hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, **110**, 67-85.

- Thompson, L. (1991). Family work: Women's sense of fairness. *Journal of Family Issues*, **12**, 181-196.
- Thompson, L., & Walker, A. J. (1989). Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work, and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **51**, 845-871.
- United Nations. (1995). *The world's women, 1995: Trends and statistics*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- Van der Zee, K. I., Buunk, B. P., & Sanderman, R. (1996). The relationship between social comparison processes and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, **20**, 551-565.
- VanYperen, N. W., & Buunk, B. P. (1991). Sex-role attitudes, social comparison, and satisfaction with relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, **54**, 169-180.
- Wood, J. V. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes. *Psychological Bulletin*, **106**, 231-248.
- Yogev, S. (1981). Do professional women have egalitarian marital relationships? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **43**, 865-871.
- Yogev, S. (1986). Marital satisfaction and sex-role perceptions among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, **4**, 35-45.